

RECEIVED

JUN 05 2001

010115

PIPER WEINBERG: My name is Piper Weinberg, actually without the ER on the end.

MR. FLAHERTY: Sorry about that.

PIPER WEINBERG: That's all right.

I also want to thank everyone for being here and encourage people to make statements, if they're moved to do so.

1 [This SDEIS doesn't seem to address a lot of issues. The current evolving design, "design" is now a verb. It's not an actual thing, a noun we can look at, it's design, how the design is going to change. And so there's a lot of impact that the SDEIS hasn't even addressed and may not be able to address until the future when the design changes.]

2 [So that's something that seems like not only should the comment period be extended, but also there should be continual impact statements being created. So along with Susi I guess I'm encouraging you guys, the DOE, to continue writing and continue working on this.]

3 [These designs increase worker exposure to radioactivity and further challenges their health. We know that a potential for fatality from cancer increases the longer you're around radiation. And a low-level facility increases the number of workers and the amount of time they're exposed to radiation leaks. So the question isn't directly addressed of how many people will develop cancer potentially and how many people will be exposed, how this will affect larger populations, their relatives, their children for generations to come.

4... So the SDEIS did not detail the long-term cumulative health impact of workers and civilians. Also [the evolution and design at the Yucca Mountain project fits into a historic context of cultural genocide. Page S-5, which contains table S-2, the very last sentence of the page says, quote, Opposing Native American viewpoints. Seems like that should be written on many of the topics, most significantly the primary one of land use and ownership.

Although the land slated for the repository is, quote, under federal control, the Western Shoshone hold title to the land and were forcibly evicted under an unjust expression of this federal control. It's telling that the only times that the Department of Energy formally registers no sentiment and takes note of different diverse viewpoints is when the federal government mandates it through laws and environmental executive order.

4 cont Democracy means that people voice their opinions and discussion and resolutions occur, not that opinions are just voiced and then dismissed when they don't fit the program. The SDEIS briefly comments on environmental justice. Quote, never disproportionately high or adversely to minority or low income population, end quote, will result from evolution of the design of the project. But after that it immediately says opposing Native American viewpoints. So the very people that are supposed to be considered are declared to not be affected, and they then disagree. It seems like there isn't good listening going on.

5 The SDEIS evaluated what is deemed cultural resources -- burial sites, sacred sites like churches, like your churches, temples, shrines. They're dismissively patronized and referred to as simple cultural resources. This maintains the program of cultural genocide which the government modified a person's spirituality and then allowed those commodities to be destroyed or moved, manipulated, misplaced behind glass in a museum.

6 Pages 3-8 and 3-9 says human activities increase the access to land could result in harmful effects intentional to the fragile resources. So both intentional destruction and disturbance by placing the surface aging facility at Midway Valley, which is a known cultural resource site, is irresponsible.

7 The biological resources on page 3-8, biological resources are everything that's living, the whole ecosystem. The DEIS reported that overall impact to biological resources would be very small. But how can a repository not affect an ecosystem function due to longevity and to a potential for major radiation release and for continual low-level release?

Also the SDEIS says that there's potential for a loss of a few more endangered species, like the tortoise, desert tortoise. It says that this kind of excuses this by saying that the tortoise population is relatively low compared to the other parts of the tortoise range, but according to genetics if the population is already low that if you further decrease the gene pool by offing individuals for radiation or building, construction in the area, etc., that we decrease the gene pool creating less genetic diversity, and the health -- let the health of the species and the chances of species survival and ability to adapt to a changing environment is decreasing.

MR. FLAHERTY: Would you begin to wrap up your comments, please.

8 PIPER WEINBERG: I'd also like to comment briefly on the water. This is the desert we're looking at. It's going to increase, this project, all of the designs increase water use, potential for contaminating the water.

9 And I think just the major point is that there's a lot that this SDEIS still needs to look at and that all the potential designs need to be studied a lot further.